

WASHINGTON CITY.

SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 6, 1854.

Mr. DANIEL DECKERT, of Pennsylvania, is authorized to receive subscriptions to this paper, and to receipt for the same.

Mr. C. W. JAMES, No. 1 Harrison street, Cincinnati, Ohio, is our general collecting agent for the Western States and Territories, assisted by H. L. THOMAS, J. F. BART, Wm. H. THOMAS, F. D. YERGEN, C. M. L. WILKINSON, A. L. CHILDS, and Dr. Wm. LIVING.

Receipts of either will be good.

Mr. ISRAEL E. JAMES, No. 123 South Third street, Philadelphia, is our general traveling agent, assisted by Wm. H. WILKINSON, J. C. COLLIER, JAMES JACKSON, J. H. HARRIS, J. M. BROWN, G. P. BROWN, ISAAC M. BROWN, EDWARD W. WILEY, WILLIAM L. WATERMAN, and GEORGE I. McLEOD.

Mr. HENRY M. LEWIS, of Montgomery, Alabama, is our general traveling agent for the States of Alabama and Tennessee, assisted by C. F. LAWRENCE, JAMES O. LEWIS, and RABBIT D. LEWIS.

Receipts from either of the above will be good.

OFFICIAL.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT.
By and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Francis A. Cheeneth, of the Territory of Washington, to be an associate justice of the supreme court in that Territory, vice Victor Munroe, removed from Territory.

William Claude Jones, of Missouri, to be attorney of the United States for the Territory of New Mexico, vice Wm. W. H. Davis, resigned.

John E. Warren, of Minnesota, to be attorney of the United States for the Territory of Minnesota, vice Daniel H. Dustin, deceased.

CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Joseph C. Hart, of New York, for Tenerife.

Townsend Harris, for Ningpo, in China.

John Higgins, of Pennsylvania, for Belfast, in Ireland.

John Kemm, of Pennsylvania, for Cork, in Ireland.

Darius A. Ogden, of New York, for Honolulu, in the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Robert S. Cassat, of Pennsylvania, for the Kingdom of Hanover.

William Hubbert, for Laguna, in Mexico.

COLLECTORS OF THE CUSTOMS.

James E. Gible, Beaufort, North Carolina, reappointed.

Thomas L. Shaw, Georgetown, South Carolina, reappointed.

Honore Moody, district of Oswegatchie, (Ogdensburg), New York, vice Thomas Bacon, rejected.

SURVEYORS OF THE CUSTOMS.

David S. Rudbeck, New London, Connecticut, vice Jason Beckwith, deceased.

Henry N. Dowd, Albany, New York, vice Robert S. Cushman, whose commission will expire August 27, 1854.

Garland Hunt, of Kentucky, to be agent for the Indians in Utah.

R. H. Landsdale, of Washington Territory, to be agent for the Indians in said Territory.

Aquila Jones, of Indiana, to be agent for the Indians in Washington Territory.

Edward Hunter, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of California, in the place of Pablo Noriega, resigned.

John S. Harker, to be surveyor of the port of Cairo, in Illinois.

William Stotts, to be surveyor of the port of Keokuk, in the State of Iowa.

William H. Merritt, to be surveyor of the port of Duquene, in the State of Iowa.

William A. Bufum, of New York, to be consul of the United States for the port of Trieste, in Austria, vice Wyndham Robertson.

William H. Emory, of the United States army, to be commissioner, on the part of the United States, to run the boundary line between the United States and the Mexican republic, according to the treaty of 30th December, 1853.

James W. Thea, to be surveyor and inspector of the revenue for the port of Tusculum, in the State of Alabama.

Paschal Bequette, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at Benicia, California, vice Charles Loring, deceased.

John A. Wheeler, of North Carolina, to be minister resident of the United States to Nicaragua.

John L. Marling, of Tennessee, to be minister resident of the United States to Guatemala.

William Grayson Mann, of the District of Columbia, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Brazil.

Frederick A. Beelen, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Chili.

Francis Durt, of South Carolina, to be governor of the Territory of Nebraska.

Charles H. Mason, of Rhode Island, to be secretary of the Territory of Washington.

CONGRESS—FRIDAY.
SENATE.—The report of the Committee on the Judiciary in relation to the right of Hon. J. W. Williams to retain his seat, was concurred in.

A large number of private bills were passed, as well as all the remaining appropriation bills but one. The time of adjournment was postponed until Monday next, in order that the numerous bills might be enrolled and signed before the termination of the session. The ocean-mail steamer appropriation bill was not passed, the committee of conference being unable to agree upon one of the amendments; and without receding, the Senate adjourned until twelve o'clock to-morrow. Thus the bill is defeated unless the House of Representatives recede from that amendment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—After our report went to press last night, the House adopted the report of the Committee of the Whole on the Senate amendments to the Post Office appropriation bill. A bill passed repealing the first proviso of the fourth section of the bonny-law land of September 28, 1850. The amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution of thanks to Captain Duncan N. Ingraham was passed, the rules being suspended by a vote of 109 to 36. The bill incorporating the Georgetown Pioneer Manufacturing Company was passed. The House refused to suspend the rules to admit the resolution conferring the title of lieutenant general by brevet for eminent services. The House adopted the report of the committee of conference on the civil and diplomatic bill, the Senate receding from the amendment for the Washington water-works, and agreeing to an appropriation of \$15,000 for the Little Falls bridge. The House refused to take up the Senate resolution containing the present session until Monday next. The House went into committee on the river and harbor bill amendments, and afterwards rose and reported its action to the House, and the report was adopted. The House then went into committee on the Senate amendments to the navy appropriation bill, and afterwards reported its action to the House, when the report was adopted, as was subsequently the report of the Committee of the Whole on the army appropriation bill.

After a recess of four hours, at 9 o'clock, a. m. the House resumed its sitting. The report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the river and harbor bill was adopted. The House insisted on the disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the mail-steamer service bill. The reciprocity-treaty bill was read a third time and passed. On motion of Mr. Campbell, the Senate joint resolution was amended so as to defer the adjournment of Congress until Monday next at 4 o'clock, a. m., provided that no motion be taken after 4 o'clock to-day other than the motion to adjourn. The amendment of the Senate to the Post Office appropriation bill, increasing the pay of the clerks in the Washington City Post Office, was concurred in, with a limitation of its provision to one year from the passage of the act. On motion of Mr. Cobb, the Secretary of the Interior was instructed to furnish the next session of Congress with statements

as to the extent and situation of the public lands, and the length of time they have been in the market. Numerous Senate bills were referred to standing committees, and sundry bills of no general interest were passed. On motion of Mr. Millon, it was ordered that when the House adjourn to-morrow it adjourn to meet at half-past 7 o'clock on Monday next. A message was received from the President vetoing the river and harbor bill; but there being no quorum, it could not be read except by unanimous consent; and this not being obtained, the House adjourned.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.
On Friday (yesterday) afternoon, at about 3 o'clock, the river and harbor bill having previously passed both houses of Congress, the following message was received in the House of Representatives from President Pierce. We shall refer to this message at length to-morrow:

To the House of Representatives:

I have received the bill entitled an act "making appropriations for the repair, preservation, and completion of certain public works heretofore commenced under authority of law." It reaches me in the expiring hours of the session, and time does not allow full opportunity for examining and considering its provisions, or of stating at length the reasons which forbid me to give it my signature.

It belongs to that class of measures which are commonly known as internal improvements by the general government, and which, from a very early period, have been deemed of doubtful constitutionality and expediency, and have thus failed to obtain the approbation of successive Chief Magistrates.

On such an examination of this bill as it has been in my power to make, I recognize in it certain provisions national in their character, and which, if they stood alone, it would be compatible with my convictions of public duty to assent to, but, at the same time, it embraces others which are merely local, and not, in my judgment, warranted by any safe or true construction of the constitution.

To make proper and sound discriminations between these different provisions would require a deliberate discussion of general principles, as well as a careful scrutiny of details, for the purpose of rightly applying those principles to each separate item of appropriation.

Public opinion with regard to the value and importance of internal improvements in the country is undivided. There is a disposition, on all hands, to have them prosecuted with energy, and to see the benefits sought to be attained by them fully realized.

The prominent point of difference between those who have been regarded as the friends of a system of internal improvements by the general government and those adverse to such a system, has been one of constitutional power, though more or less connected with considerations of expediency.

My own judgment, it is well known, has, on both grounds, been opposed to "a general system of internal improvements" by the federal government. I have entertained the most serious doubts, from the inherent difficulties of its application, as well as from past unsatisfactory experience, whether the power could be so exercised by the general government as to render its use advantageous either to the country at large, or effectual for the accomplishment of the object contemplated.

I shall consider it incumbent on me to present to Congress, at its next session, a matured view of the whole subject, and to endeavor to define, approximately at least, and according to my own convictions, what appropriations of this nature, by the general government, the great interests of the United States require, and the constitution will admit, and sanction in case no substitute should be devised, capable of reconciling differences, both of constitutionality and expediency.

In the absence of the requisite means and time for duly considering the whole subject at present, and discussing such possible substitute, it becomes necessary to return this bill to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and, for the reasons thus briefly submitted to the consideration of Congress, to withhold from it my approval.

FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON, August 4, 1854.

THE GREYTOWN AFFAIR AND THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.
We are gratified to understand from the *Intelligencer* that the editors of that journal "have not applied any censure to the conduct of Captain Hollins"—they only intended to say that the act of bombarding and burning Greytown was barbarous. "The act," say they, "might be barbarous, yet performed with all regard for humanity possible." If we now understand our neighbors correctly, they give Capt. Hollins credit for proceeding to destroy the town with all possible regard for humanity, but yet that the act itself was a "barbarity"—this "barbarity" existed in his orders, if he construed them aright. The *Intelligencer* evidently designs by implication to lodge the charge of barbarity against the administration which issued the orders. We have already published the instructions given to Captain Hollins by Secretary Dobbin, as well as the letter of Secretary Marcy to Mr. Fabens, but the charge implied in the language of the *Intelligencer* is so grave that it is due to those gentlemen that its groundlessness be again exposed by a recurrence to the orders themselves. So much of the letter of instructions given to Captain Hollins by Mr. Dobbin as bears upon the question under examination is contained in the following extracts:

"The property of the American citizens interested in the Accessory Transit Company, it is said, has been unlawfully detained by persons residing in Greytown. Apprehension is felt that further outrages will be committed. Our minister, Mr. Borland, has been treated with rudeness and disrespect. You will, however, learn from Mr. Fabens, commercial agent at Greytown, more particularly of the conduct of those people and the views of our government, which have been communicated to him from the State Department. You will consult with him freely, and ascertain the true state of the facts. Now, it is very desirable that these people should be taught that the United States will not tolerate these outrages, and that they have the power and the determination to check them. It is, however, very much to be hoped that you can effect the purposes of your visit without a resort to violence and destruction of property and life. In the presence of your vessel will, no doubt, work much good. The department repeats much in your prudence and good sense."

Mr. Dobbin specified in general terms the outrages alleged to have been committed by the people of Greytown, and he says to Capt. Hollins that "it is very desirable that these people should be taught that the United States will not tolerate these outrages, and that they have the power and the determination to check them." Assuming that the outrages specified had been committed, we submit to the editors of the *Intelligencer* whether it was not the duty of our government to interfere for purposes of redress? It will not be denied that the administration would have been justly censurable if it had failed to interfere. This point being clear, we earnestly insist that it was not "barbarity" in Mr. Dobbin to direct Captain Hollins to teach the perpetrators of the wrongs that their outrages would not be tolerated. If there is any "barbarity" in Mr. Dobbin's instructions it is in announcing a determination on the part of our government not to tolerate injuries to the property and persons and honor of its citizens; and yet the *National Intelligencer* sees in this noble American sentiment "barbarity!"

So much of Mr. Marcy's letter of instructions to our commercial agent, Mr. Fabens, as bears upon the charge of the *Intelligencer* is as follows:

"You were instructed in my former letter to notify the people of San Juan to repair the injury they have caused to the Accessory Transit Company, by withholding from it the property which had been stolen and taken to San Juan, and by protecting the persons who were guilty of the felony. It is hoped that the town will have adjusted that matter to the entire satisfaction of the company, and in that way Commander Hollins will be relieved from the disagreeable necessity of taking any action in regard to that subject. You will, on the arrival of Commander Hollins, explain to him what has been done in that matter."

"Mr. Borland, our minister to Central America, has represented to this government that, while recently at San Juan, he was insulted by the authorities or people of that place. As indignity offered to the nation, as well as to him individually, cannot be permitted to pass unnoticed. If done by order of the authorities of the place, they must answer for it in their assumed political character. Nothing short of an apology for the outrage will save the place from the indignity that such an act justly merits. It is expected that this apology will be promptly made, and satisfactory assurances given to Commander Hollins of future good conduct towards the United States, and public functionaries who may in future be at that place."

"If the outrage was committed by lawless individuals without the authority or connivance of the town, then it is clearly the duty of those who exercise the civil power at San Juan to inflict upon them exemplary punishment. The neglect to do this is an insult to justice, on the part of the nominal magistrates there, the responsibility for the acts of those individuals. In such a case, not to punish is an implied sanction of the acts of the transgressors. It is hoped that the authorities will be prepared to satisfy Commander Hollins that they have done what was incumbent on them in the way of bringing the offenders to punishment."

"We are entirely at a loss to discover in the foregoing a shadow of a pretext for the charge of 'barbarity.' Surely the *Intelligencer* does not base its charge upon the declaration by Mr. Marcy that 'an indignity offered to the nation, as well as to him (Mr. Borland) individually, cannot be permitted to pass unnoticed.' This is but a reiteration of the noble sentiment of President Pierce in his inaugural address, which thrilled through the hearts of his countrymen, that the rights of American citizens, no matter in what part of the globe, should be protected by the whole power of the government. But perhaps the *Intelligencer* bases its charge of 'barbarity' upon the declaration of Mr. Marcy, that if the indignity was offered 'by order of the authorities of the place, they must answer for it in their assumed political character. Nothing short of an apology (adds Mr. Marcy) for the outrages will save the place from the indignity that such an act justly merits.' Was it barbarous in Mr. Marcy to express his willingness to receive an apology for a gross indignity to an American minister? If the offenders should refuse to accede to this mild suggestion, was it barbarous to declare that the place would be visited by the indignity that such an act justly merits? To have said less would have been to abandon the protection of American citizens in foreign lands when subjected to insult and indignity."

After making this grave imputation, the *Intelligencer* makes an awkward attempt to escape from the responsibility of its position by saying that "in justice to the government, we are free to admit the difficulty of framing precise and definite instructions for the punishment of such an offence and such offenders as Captain Hollins was despatched to Greytown to punish." We are unable to see how the editors of the *Intelligencer* could in one breath declare that there was "barbarity" in the orders given to Captain Hollins, and in the next virtually eat its own words by admitting the difficulty of framing precise and definite instructions for the punishment of such an offence. The least that they should have done was to point out the clause or sentence or word in the instructions which sustains the charge of "barbarity." This could not be done, and hence the constrained admission "in justice to the government."

But the concluding remarks of the *Intelligencer* are even more extraordinary than those on which we have commented. After having denounced the destruction of Greytown as a "barbarity," and then fixed the responsibility of the "barbarity" upon the government by locating it in the instructions given to Captain Hollins, the editors moderate their tone, and say:

"We apprehend that the real error in the affair will be found to consist in a little too much precipitancy on the part of the government—first in giving credence to interested statements, and then resolving too promptly to inflict signal and condign punishment on what it conceived to be a heinous national insult, yet without any distinct idea of the nature or measure of punishment to be inflicted—an opinion which finds much support in the articles which we submit, supposing them to be not entire perversions of the truth. They are from known sources, and are quoted from the columns of a democratic journal."

After all, then, it turns out that "the real error will be found in a little too much precipitancy on the part of the government"—not "barbarity," but precipitancy, and only a little too much of that! But how has the government been precipitate? The *Intelligencer* says, "In giving credence to interested statements, and resolving too promptly to inflict signal and condign punishment." &c. It is difficult to imagine a case in which the government could be expected to have more reliable statements than in this case. To say nothing of the statements of parties interested in the Transit Company, they had the information furnished by one of our commercial agents and by one of our first-class ministers—two gentlemen selected by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, to fill high and responsible stations. If statements made by such men are at a loss to know what credence of the government, we are at a loss to know what kind of evidence the *Intelligencer* finds much support to its opinion as to the precipitancy of the government in two articles which it publishes, and of which it says: "They are from known sources, and are quoted from the columns of a democratic journal."

The first is a letter of Mr. Wood, who throws suspicion over his whole statement by declaring in the close of his letter that thirty thousand dollars would not repair the loss sustained by the firm of S. S. Wood & Son. The *Intelligencer* discredits the statements on which the government acted, because they were "interested," and yet fortifies its own opinion by quoting from a man who claims thirty thousand dollars for his share of the loss! The other article is an anonymous letter addressed to the Boston Atlas, and therefore not from a source known to us. But the *Intelligencer* says it quotes these articles "from the columns of a democratic paper." The first is from the New York Evening Post, and the other from the Boston Atlas—the former an abolition sheet, which no orthodox democrat recognizes as a democratic paper, and the other a notorious abolition and whig journal. These are the sources from which the *Intelligencer* derives its facts to sustain the charge of a little too much precipitancy on the part of the government, and these statements the *Intelligencer* regards as more reliable than those made by such men as Messrs. Borland and Fabens. The *Intelligencer* may assail the administration upon such evidence as that on which it relies, but just men, who are not predetermined to condemn, will reject all such testimony when it comes in conflict with that of reliable men such as those on whose statements the government has acted in the Greytown affair.

The following letter is from a reliable gentleman in Mississippi. We hope its publication may excite the mail agents to greater vigilance in preventing such delinquencies as our correspondent complains of:

For the Union.

Ms. Editor: Can you tell what becomes of documents sent by members of Congress to their constituents which never arrive? For instance, the census report of 1850 was sent to the writer last spring by Hon. Wm. Barksdale, not finding its way to its destination, the Hon. Mr. Wright sent your correspondent, who happened to be in Washington, to direct one to himself, and he would frank it, as it was quite inconvenient for him to carry it with him. A month and more has elapsed, and no census report yet!

Do you think postmasters steal them for the purpose of selling them? or do they throw them under the counter, or in the street, or what becomes of them?

Your paper comes very often in three weeks; sometimes it comes straight along in one week. The special agent of the department might see some things if he would pass along the Charleston and Memphis line.

Yours, H.

POST OFFICE DERELICTIONS.
Ms. Editor: Can you tell what becomes of documents sent by members of Congress to their constituents which never arrive? For instance, the census report of 1850 was sent to the writer last spring by Hon. Wm. Barksdale, not finding its way to its destination, the Hon. Mr. Wright sent your correspondent, who happened to be in Washington, to direct one to himself, and he would frank it, as it was quite inconvenient for him to carry it with him. A month and more has elapsed, and no census report yet!

Do you think postmasters steal them for the purpose of selling them? or do they throw them under the counter, or in the street, or what becomes of them?

Your paper comes very often in three weeks; sometimes it comes straight along in one week. The special agent of the department might see some things if he would pass along the Charleston and Memphis line.

Yours, H.

OUR RELATIONS WITH SPAIN.—REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.
The report submitted to the Senate by Mr. Mason, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, upon the message of the President in regard to the necessity for the enactment of provisional measures, will be read with interest. It will be seen that the committee agree entirely with the positions taken by the President in his message of the 15th of March, and reiterated in his message of the 1st of June, and for the short time until Congress will again be in session, would report bills to carry out the suggestions of the Executive as to provisional measures. We cannot but regret this conclusion of the committee; but, as we know that they have been actuated by none but patriotic considerations, we are not disposed to indulge in censure or complaint. Whilst we regret the conclusion to which the committee arrived, we are highly gratified to see that the able and experienced statesmen who compose it concur so cordially with the sentiments of the President's message. This announcement will carry with it a moral weight that may prove beneficial in the further prosecution of negotiations with the government of Spain. The report of the committee is as follows:

"The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the message of the President of the United States of the first of the present month, in reply to the resolution of the Senate asking information 'whether anything has arisen since the passage of his message to the House of Representatives of the 15th of March last, concerning our relations with the government of Spain, which, in his opinion, may dispense with the suggestions therein contained touching the propriety of 'provisional measures' by Congress to meet any exigency that may arise in the recess of Congress affecting those relations,' report:

"The committee entirely concur with the President in the declaration contained in his message to the House of Representatives, and reiterated in his message to the Senate, that 'in view of the position of the island of Cuba, its proximity to our coast, and the relations which it must ever bear to our commercial and other interests, it is vain to expect that a series of unfriendly acts, infringing our commercial rights, and the adoption of a policy threatening the peace of the island, can long be tolerated without our feeling it necessary to take measures to protect our rights, and to assure that, whatever measures may be found necessary to insure future security and repose to the country, (announced from the quarter indicated,) and to vindicate the honor of our flag, will be adopted by Congress. An earnest hope, both on the part of the President and of Congress, that the difficulties with Spain referred to in the message may have been adjusted before the termination of the present session by an amicable arrangement, has, as it would appear, caused both to forbear until but a short interval remains between the close of the present and the stated commencement of the next meeting of Congress."

"The full preparation that has been demanded by the Executive, with adequate guarantees for the future, will undoubtedly be the just expectations of the country, and the committee would not hesitate to recommend the 'provisional measures' suggested by the President, to be executed by him in the recess of Congress, until the difficulties of adjusting them when the close of the session is already at hand, were the interval to be long before the next meeting of Congress. As that will be, however, but of four months duration, the committee believe that the better on the whole to leave the subject as it is at present, with the Executive. Should the occasion unfortunately render it necessary, it must of course occupy the earliest attention of Congress at its next meeting. And for the above reasons the committee ask to be discharged."

The request of the committee was agreed to, and the report ordered to be printed.

THE UNLAWFULNESS OF KNOW-NOTHINGISM.
The celebrated author of "The Spirit of Laws," so distinguished for his great love of mankind, his desire for their happiness, his sentiments of liberty, and the wisdom of his counsel for its acquisition and preservation, has classified the crimes against it under four divisions: "Those of the first species are prejudicial to religion, the second to morals, the third to the public tranquillity, and the fourth to the security of the subject."

It has been said that the path of right is like the bridge of Al Sirat—a single hair's breadth to the right or left and we are inevitably lost. No human provision can estimate the consequences to our common liberty from the slightest departure from the principles upon which it rests.

Are we prepared to depart from the principles which have "made and maintained us a nation," and for all the consequences which must flow from such a departure? Are we prepared to discriminate against the exercise of religious freedom by practically enforcing that which the monarchy of Britain has lately abandoned as untenable—religious qualification for office? Are we prepared religiously to trample upon the rights of the citizen under the constitution and the laws, by discriminating against both, and establishing a test not known to either—the accident of birth?

Let those banded together with such objects look steadily to the consequences, and be taught by the example of the past. Let them look at the wars of races and the wars in the name of religion. Is liberty to engender in her womb the serpent brood of sin and death, to nestle within and tear her own vitals? Is America, destined to present her confair of all races and all opinions, an epitome of all the past in a bloody struggle for ascendancy?

Let those who lead their aid to kindle the fires beware, lest they, too, perish in the conflagration. Let the ministers of religion guard their flocks from deserting their faith by dragging it into the political arena.

THE INSULT TO MAJOR BORLAND.
The original cause of the insult to Maj. Borland is found in the protection which he gave to Capt. Smith, when an attempt was made to arrest him for killing Antonio, one of his native pilots. Maj. Borland says, in his letter to the Secretary of State, that his interference for the protection of Captain Smith had no reference to the question of his guilt or innocence, but to his rights as an American citizen. But, by way of casting odium on Maj. Borland, the *National Intelligencer* speaks of his interference as the protection given to a "murderer." The following statement of the facts as to the killing of Antonio by Captain Smith, as we find them reported in the *Star* a few days since, show that the killing was clearly justifiable:

"It seems that Captain Smith, of the American steamer *Routh*, navigating the San Juan river, some months since dismissed one of his native pilots, named Antonio, a ferocious fellow, who subsequently threatened to take his life on his first favorable occasion. On the down trip of the *Routh*, when Mr. Borland was passing on her, coming home, the lost crew of her rudder by an accident, and was for the most part steered with setting poles. When about eight miles from San Juan she became unmanageable in a narrow channel of deep and rapid water. To save her from 'grounding,' Captain Smith ordered her to be made fast to a 'bungo' (native boat), lying near at hand, which proved to be the boat of Antonio. The latter had the rope of the steamer cut at once, and, seizing a double-barrelled gun, levelled it to shoot Captain Smith, who was standing with the steamer's wheel in his hand. A woman on board the *Routh*, however, jerked the gun from his hand, and ere he could recover it, the steamer, being loosened from the bungo, was swept violently away by the current—grounding on the other side of the river. In their efforts to prevent this catastrophe, the hands lost two of their setting poles near the bungo, and as soon as possible the steamer headed so, as to recover them. On her second approach towards the bungo for that purpose, the ex-pilot again seized his gun, and ordered Captain Smith not to approach nearer, or he would shoot him. He made his threat, and prepared to carry it into execution, though he knew that Capt. S. was the boat was almost wholly unmanageable. Smith, finding it impossible to stop her headway, and fearing that he would shoot in the crowd of passengers, stepped out of the wheel-house instantly, when the ruffian snatched down and raised his double-barrelled gun to shoot. But S. was too quick for him, as he seized his rifle and shot him as he was on the point of pulling the trigger. There were the facts of the shooting affair, as testified by Dr. Smith of San Francisco, Adams & Co.'s express messenger, and a lady passenger, who, as well as the Hon. Mr. Borland, were in the wheel-house at the time."

OPERATIONS OF THE MINT.—The statement of the operations of the mint in July shows the total bullion deposited to have amounted to \$4,250,000, consisting of \$3,940,000 in gold (all from California except \$50,000) and \$310,000 in silver. The whole amount of coinage accounted amounted in value to \$3,587,850 02, embracing \$3,406,351 94 in gold, and \$181,498 08 in silver. The items of gold and silver coinage were as annexed:

Gold.

Denomination.	No. of pieces.	Value.
Double eagles.....	45,409	\$908,180 00
Eagles.....	9,234	92,340 00
Dollars.....	—	2,405,811 96
Total.....		2,406,531 96

Silver.

Denomination.	No. of pieces.	Value.
Quarter dollars.....	368,000	\$92,000 00
Dimes.....	880,000	88,000 00
Total.....		180,000 00

Hence it appears that the constitution of the several States is but auxiliary and subordinate to the bill of rights, the barriers to protect and maintain the rights therein declared inviolate. Consequently, bills of right stand in relation to the constitution as the constitution does to laws, and paramount to both.

To this view of the superiority of bills of rights we have the authority of Mr. Jefferson, who thought that "where the interpreting power was, there was the sovereignty."

and that "the bill of rights was a legal check on the judiciary," or, in other words, the declaration of the sovereignty of the people constantly pronouncing upon the just interpretation of the constitution and the laws.

This brings us to the object of our inquiry—the lawfulness of combinations to deprive any citizen of a State of his rights, reserved in her bill of rights, protected by her constitution, and maintained by her laws.

There is not a bill of rights appended to the constitution of any State in the confederacy which does not declare religious freedom to be an indefensible, inalienable, natural right, reserved to each individual, and which he has not surrendered to the State, and in regard to which the constitution and laws have no control or authority whatever. Hence it follows that the constitution or laws of any State which impair or restrain, directly or indirectly, immediately or remotely, this right, are, as to such provisions, void.

If the doctrine thus propounded is sound, and the authorities by which it is supported to be relied on, the only constitution in the Union—that of New Hampshire—which restrains the freedom of religious liberty by confining the right to represent the people in either branch of its legislature to those entertaining particular religious dogmas is void, being in direct violation of her bill of rights, that which not one of all the States is more distinct and absolute in its enunciation of the principle contended for. The first article of her bill of rights declares:

"When men enter into a state of society, they surrender up some of their natural rights to that society, in order to secure the protection of others, and, without such an equivalent, the surrender is void."

Among the natural rights, some are, in their very nature, unalienable, because no equivalent can be received for them. Of this kind are the rights of conscience."

"Every individual has a natural and unalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and reason, and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season of his own choice, for his religious profession, sentiments, or persuasion, provided he doth not disturb the public peace, or disturb others in their religious worship."

"All elections ought to be free, and every inhabitant of the State having proper qualifications has equal right to elect and be elected into office."

If, then, the bill of rights is declaratory of the principles by which the constitution and laws are to be interpreted, one of two consequences follows—the provision of the constitution which deprives any citizen, other than of the Protestant faith, of the right to be "elected to office" is void, or those other than of the Protestant faith, not having received the equivalent, equal rights, for the surrender of their natural rights, are, by the declaration of the bill of rights itself not bound by the constitution and laws, since it expressly declares that "without such an equivalent the surrender is void."